

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-3 are pending in the application, and that claims 1-3 are rejected. By this amendment, claims 1-2 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-3 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Objection to the Title

The title of the invention is objected to as not descriptive. Applicant suggests the following title: "Electronically Controlled Sealing, Unsealing And/Or Bonding System With Metal Strip Or Wire Coated With Liquefiable Substance for Redundant Application and Tamper Detection," and has amended the title accordingly.

The Applicant respectfully submits the amended title as germane to the instant invention and claimed subject matter; and therefore withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Abstract

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of informalities. The abstract has been rewritten to emphasize that which is claimed in the instant application.

Applicant respectfully submits the amended Abstract as germane to the instant invention claimed; and withdraw of objection is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, all structure claimed in claims 1-3 (metal coated with liquefiable substance, shorting out opposite poles of the same power source, receiving groove around the cross panel, heating process, etc.) must be shown. To best show the cross-sectional figure of the metal and coating with appropriate hatching is needed.

A new set of drawings has been produced and herewith submitted to include the specific figures teaching the claimed subject matter; and enhanced with a requested cross-sectional view added to the original three dimensional isometric figure displaying the electronic seal around the door of a protected containment, per the Examiner's request. No new matter has been entered, and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection Under 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baggott US 2,662,045. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Baggott discloses a system for bonding comprising thin metal strip 13 coated with plastic resin 12 that melts when current is applied to the metal strip.

However, the present invention is not the same as Baggotts' bonding metal strip, and the Examiner's astute observation of claim 1's inadequacies is greatly appreciated. Claim 1 has been amended in the following manner to remedy any confusion.

Because the sealing and unsealing is for electronic packaging and as a detectable security seal that can be operated locally and/or from remote signaling and because the metal strip is just a connected component of the invention the following words are added in the first three lines of claim 1: (activation *before* System) and (secure *before* sealing) and (the system *before* shorting out) to read:

An activation system for secure sealing, unsealing and/or bonding, comprising a mechanism using a conductive metal wire or thin metal strip coated with a substance that liquefies when the wire is heated by the system shorting out the opposite poles.

Applicant has amended claim 1 hopefully in a manner that satisfies the Examiner to allow applicant to traverse the rejection to claim 1 and also any transferred objection to dependant claims 2 and 3. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-3 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1: In line 3, “of” (second occurrence) must be deleted. In line 8 “a” must be inserted after “and.” In line 8 “the” must be changed to “an”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 2: In line 3 “and or” must be changed to “and/or”.

Applicant has amended the claims above as indicated by the Examiner in the above manner for both objections and rejections and submits herewith. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that, as described above, the cited prior art does not show or suggest the combination of features recited in the claims. Applicant does not concede that the cited prior art shows any of the elements recited in the claims. However, Applicant has provided specific examples of elements in the claims that are clearly not present in the cited prior art.

Applicant strongly emphasizes that one reviewing the prosecution history should not interpret any of the examples Applicant has described herein in connection with distinguishing over the prior art as limiting to those specific features in isolation. Rather, Applicant asserts that it is the combination of elements recited in each of the claims, when each claim is interpreted as a whole, which is patentable. Applicant has emphasized certain features in the claims as clearly not present in the cited references, as discussed above. However, Applicant does not concede that other features in the claims are found in the prior art. Rather, for the sake of simplicity, Applicant is providing examples of why the claims described above are distinguishable over the cited prior art.

Applicant wishes to clarify for the record, if necessary, that the claims have been amended to expedite prosecution. Moreover, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original subject matter recited in the present claims in a continuation application.

Any narrowing amendments made to the claims in the present Amendment are not to be construed as a surrender of any subject matter between the original claims and the present claims; rather merely Applicant's best attempt at providing one or more definitions of what the Applicant believes to be suitable patent protection. In addition, the present claims provide the intended scope of protection that Applicant is seeking for this application. Therefore, no estoppel should be presumed, and Applicant's claims are intended to include a scope of protection under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Further, Applicant hereby retracts any arguments and/or statements made during prosecution that were rejected by the Examiner during prosecution and/or that were unnecessary to obtain allowance, and only maintains the arguments that persuaded the Examiner with respect to the allowability of the patent claims, as one of ordinary skill would understand from a review of the prosecution history. That is, Applicant specifically retracts statements that one of ordinary skill would recognize from reading the file history were not necessary, not used and/or were rejected by the Examiner in allowing the patent application.

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the Application is in condition for allowance, and that such action is earnestly solicited.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required for this Amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

In the event that an Extension of Time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an Extension of Time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that Extension of Time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an Extension of Time or credit any overpayment for an Extension of Time to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

Respectfully submitted,

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP



Irahn H. Donner
Registration No. 35,120

399 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10022
TEL (212) 230-8887
FAX (212) 230-8888

Date: 2/14/05
IHD